

REMARKS

Claim 12 is canceled without prejudice, claims 17 and 18 are added, and therefore claims 9 to 11 and 13 to 18 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

With respect to paragraph one (1) of the Office Action, copies of the foreign references should have been provided by the International Search Authority. In any event, courtesy copies of the foreign references accompany this response. It is respectfully requested that the references of the previously filed IDS and PTO-1449 papers be considered and made of record, as required by the Patent Office.

As to paragraph three (3), claims 9 and 14 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claims 9 and 14 have been rewritten. Applicant respectfully requests that the indefiniteness rejections be withdrawn.

As to paragraph five (5), claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,309,132 ("Jakob").

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claims 9 and 14 have been rewritten. Claim 9, as presented, is to a "*self-locking* bolt having engagement surfaces for a tool at an end of the shank, wherein the head is round and has a smooth surface." The Office Action asserts that in "Jakob", Fig. 1 (36) shows a head which is "round and has a smooth surface." Since the surface opposite the shank in "Jakob" has a hexagon shaped tool interface rendering it anything but "smooth," it is assumed that it is being asserted that the rim of the flange is "round and has a smooth surface." Claim 9, as presented, provides that at least the surface opposite the shank is smooth, and further provides that the bolt is *self-locking*. Accordingly, "Jakob" does not identically disclose (nor even suggest) all of the features of claim 9, so that claim 9 as presented is allowable.

Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 depend from claim 9, as presented, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

As regards paragraph seven (7), claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over "Jakob" in view of EP 0747604. Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 9, as presented, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons, since any review of the secondary reference makes plain that it does not cure -- and it not asserted to cure -- the critical deficiencies of the primary reference.

New claims 17 and 18 do not add any new matter and are supported by the present application. Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 9, as presented, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, claims 9 to 11 and 13 to 18 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of claims 9 to 11 and 13 to 18 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn, since all issues raised have been addressed and obviated. An early and favorable action on the merits is therefore respectfully requested.

Dated: 10/26/2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

*Aug 11.
33, 865
Hara C.
DEPT (H)*